UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/992,413	11/18/2001	William Ho Chang	1282-011/MMM	5528

21034 7590 05/25/2010		

IPSOLON LLP
111 SW COLUMBIA
SUITE 710
PORTLAND, OR 97201

EXAMINER
NAWAZ, ASAD M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2455	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/25/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/992,413	CHANG ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ASAD M. NAWAZ	2455	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *2/22/10*.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *131-200* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *131-200* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the amendments received 9/30/09. Claims 131-135,

147-149, 151, 157, 159-160, 163-164, 166-168, 172, 177-178, 180-187, and 192 have

been amended. No new claims have been added and no claims have been canceled.

Accordingly, claims 131-200 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 130-200 have been considered but

are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Examiner's Note - 35 USC § 112

3.   The examiner has noted the use of 35 USC 112, 6th paragraph, means plus

function language in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 131, 133-137, 143-200 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

taught by Yacoub (US Patent No 6,452,692) further in view of Sugahara (US Patent No

7,593,123).

As to claim 131, Yacoub teaches a data output service system for rendering at
an output device output content managed from a mobile information apparatus, the
mobile information apparatus being distinct and separate from the output device, the
system comprising:

means for receiving at a server application operated on a server a document
object and an output device object, the document object and the output device object
being received at the server application from the mobile information apparatus over a
network that is distinct from the information apparatus and the output device, the
document object relating to the output content and the output device object having one
or more attributes corresponding to the output device (col 2, liens 29-43; the mobile
user sends a print document and the preferences to a server);

means for generating at the server with the server application device dependent
output data related to the output device for rendering the output content (col 2, lines 29-
53; the server automatically determines which printer of the printers on the network
comply with the preferences, spools a job, and updates software/drivers) and

means for delivering the output data to the mobile information apparatus for
rendering the output content at the output device (col 2, lines 29-43; printer prints job).

However, Yacoub does not explicitly indicate means for generating device
dependent output data wherein the device dependent output data is related to a
language and/or data format that is acceptable as input for rendering.

Sugahara teaches an apparatus in which one such output device attribute is the language wherein the printing devices are categorized by language groups (see col 1, lines 42-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Suguhara into those of Yacoub to make the system more efficient. By allowing the system of Yacoub to receive device dependent data and allowing a group of device categorized as being able to serve the same data, more jobs can be served in less time.

As to claim 133, Yacoub teaches the system of claim 131 further comprising means for receiving from the mobile information apparatus one or more job objects having one or more attributes corresponding to the output job, including output quality (col 5, lines 29-42).

As to claim 134, Yacoub teaches the system of claim 133 in which the output object includes a pointer or a reference to the language or data format (see Sugahara col 1, lines 42-65).

As to claim 135, Yacoub teaches the system of claim 131 in which the output device includes a display output control unit for displaying data content (abstract).

As to claim 136, Yacoub teaches the system of claim 131 in which the output device is a printer and the output data includes one or more of an image data, a graphics data, and text data (col 2, lines 29-53).

As to claim 137, Yacoub teaches the system of claim 131 in which the mobile information apparatus is a wireless mobile information apparatus and includes one or

more of a palmtop computer, a handheld computer, a laptop computer, a personal

digital assistance(PDA), a smart phone, a screen phone, Internet pad, internet

appliance, and a digital camera (col 12, lines 10-20).

As to claim 159, Yacoub teaches the method of claim 157 in which the

generating of the output data for each selected output device includes one or more of

invoking, launching, calling, utilizing, and involving one or more applications (col 2,

lines 29-53).

As to claim 160, Yacoub teaches the method of claim 157 in which the

generating of the output data for each selected output device includes at least partially

one or more of a conversion operation and an raster image processing operation (col 2,

lines 29-53).

As to claim 161, Yacoub teaches the method of claim 157 further comprising

discovering with the mobile information apparatus one or more output devices as being

available for rendering the output content (col 2, lines 29-53).

As to claims 143-158 and 162-200, the contain similar limitations as the claims

above and are rejected under similar rationale.

6.   Claims 132 and 138-142 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Yacoub and Sugahara in view of Stewart (USPGPUB

2004/0057075).

As to claim 132, Yacoub and Sugahara teach the system of claim 131 however, does not explicitly indicate means for obtaining payment information from the information apparatus as payment for the data output service provided at the output device or as payment for receiving the output data from the server.

Stewart teaches means for obtaining payment information from the information apparatus as payment for the data output service provided at the output device or as payment for sending the output data from the server (0052).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Stewart et al into those of Yacoub and Sugahara to make the system more user friendly. By providing a large pool of resources to the users and letting them decide whether the fee is fair, a user friendly system can be achieved.

As to claim 138, Yacoub and Sugahara teach the system of claim 132, however, Yacoub does not teach the payment information is provided automatically by the mobile information apparatus.

Stewart teches the payment information is provided automatically by the mobile information apparatus (0052).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Stewart et al into those of Yacoub and Sugahara to make the system more user friendly. By providing a large pool of resources to the users and letting them decide whether the fee is fair, a user friendly system can be achieved.

As to claim 139, Yacoub and Sugahara teach the system of claim 132, however does not teach the payment information is provided through the mobile information apparatus as entered by a user in response to a prompt to enter payment information.

Stewart teaches the payment information is provided through the mobile information apparatus as entered by a user in response to a prompt to enter payment information (0052).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Stewart et al into those of Yacoub and Sugahara to make the system more user friendly. By providing a large pool of resources to the users and letting them decide whether the fee is fair, a user friendly system can be achieved.

As to claim 140, Yacoub and Sugahara teach the system of claim 132, however, does not explicitly indicate the payment information includes service subscriber information corresponding to a pre-arranged subscription to the data output service system.

Stewart teaches the payment information includes service subscriber information corresponding to a pre-arranged subscription to the data output service system (0052)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Stewart et al into those of Yacoub and Sugahara to make the system more user friendly. By providing a large pool of resources to the users and letting them decide whether the fee is fair, a user friendly system can be achieved.

As to claim 141, Yacoub and Sugahara teach the system of claim 140, however, does not teach correlating the data output service subscriber information with a subscriber database that stores subscriber profiles with subscription payment information.

Stewart teaches correlating the data output service subscriber information with a subscriber database that stores subscriber profiles with subscription payment information (0052).

As to claim 142, Yacoub and Sugahara teaches the system of claim 131, however, does not teach obtaining authentication information from the mobile information apparatus to authenticate permission for the information apparatus to access the data output service.

Stewart teaches obtaining authentication information from the mobile information apparatus to authenticate permission for the information apparatus to access the data output service (0018, 0046).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Stewart et al into those of Yacoub and Sugahara to make the system more secure.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to ASAD M. NAWAZ whose telephone number is

(571)272-3988. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Asad M Nawaz/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2455